

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/057,261	04/08/1998	TIMOTHY P. O'HAGAN	TELNP0157US	6228
23623	7590 08/27/2002			
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP 1900 EAST 9TH STREET, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 24TH FLOOR,			EXAMINER	
			KNEPPER, DAVID D	
CLEVELAND			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2654	
			DATE MAIL ED. 09/27/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Qr

			9_		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/057,261	O'HAGAN, TIMOTHY	P. /		
,	Examiner	Art Unit			
	David D. Knepper	2654			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ess		
THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply the holders and a proper the holders and the supplication in the	to a on in		
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offi	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. S R 1.136(a) and the approperation of the fee. The approportionally set in the final O	n. see MPEP priate extension priate extension ffice action; or		
 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR) 	s Brief must be filed within the pe				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth-	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	plifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	mendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	idered but does NOT	place the		
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	• •	to issues which were	newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			d an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:	•				
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examine	er.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).				
0. Other:	Da	rid S. Kuppe	M		
		David D. Knepper Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2654			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant mischaracherizes the state of the art as teaching that Hidden Markov Models (HMMs) are limited in use such that they can only "decode speech". To the contrary, HMMs.are taught in Barclay as defining speech recognition vocabulary (lexicon) in column 2 which is further taught as running on a laptop or other such small computer. The term "grammar and vocabulary" used by Barclay in column 3 does not exclude the use of phoneme based vocabulary. Applicant's argument contradicts the facts presented by Barclay in column 1-2 that teach that it is obvious to use HMMs to define such a vocabulary.